



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,619	10/21/2000	Jan Fandrianto	KTI-005	9094

5073 7590 07/23/2004

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
2001 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 600  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

JUNTIMA, NITTAYA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2663

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/694,619	FANDRIANTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nittaya Juntima	2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8,20 and 35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 61-64 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,10,12-15,21-34,37,39-41,43,45 and 54-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9,11,16-19,36,38,42,44,46-53 and 60 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on May 3, 2004.
2. Claims 8, 20, and 35 have been cancelled as per the amendment.
3. Claims 6, 25-27, and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
4. Claims 13-14 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).
5. Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 28-34, 37, 39-41, 43, 45, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
6. Claims 9, 11, 16-19, 36, 38, 42, 44, 46-53, and 60 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. Claims 61-64 are allowed.

### *Claim Objections*

8. Claims 1, 3, 13, 26, 28-29, 39, 45-46, and 60-61 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- claim 1, line 17, "and" should be deleted;
- line 21, "that transfers" should be added after "transferring," and
- "the communication channel" should be changed to "a communication" to make the claim more clear since the actual channel is not transferred;
- claim 3, line 2, "the" should be changed to "a," see line 9 of claim 1;
- claim 13, line 13, "a" should be changed to "the," and
- line 14, "a" should be changed to "the;"

Art Unit: 2663

- claim 26, line 53, "a third" should be changed to "the third;"
- claim 28, line 6, a colon should be added after "wherein;"
  - lines 19-20, "the communication channel" should be changed to "a communication" to make the claim more clear since the actual channel is not transferred;
- claim 29, line 2, "the conferencing module" should be changed to "the channel establishment module" and "and" should be changed to "which," see claim 3 and specification pg. 9, lines 17-18;
- claim 39, line 5, a colon should be added after "wherein" and line 12, "and" should be deleted;
- claim 45, line 11, "a" should be changed to "the," and line 12, "a" should be changed to "the;"
- claim 46, line 9, "can not" should be changed to "cannot;"
- claim 60, line 4, "a second" should be changed to "the second;" and
- claim 61, lines 9 and 11 should be further indented.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 6, 25-27, and 54-56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claim 6, the limitation “the identification code” lacks antecedent basis. Shouldn’t the claim depend on claim 5? Note that because the claim contains limitation similar to that of claim 40, therefore, the claim would have been rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 40.

- Claim 25, since the preamble calls for “maintaining a conference call when a first station disconnects from the conference call,” the claim is vague and indefinite due to the following:

a) It cannot be determined as how the limitation “if it is determined that …, then transmitting a transfer request…” in lines 7-11 of the claim is related to maintaining the conference call when the first station disconnects from the call as recited in the preamble. If it is determined that the connection channel between the first and the second stations is established, (i) how would the conference be maintained as a result of this determination, and (ii) how (or when) would the first station ever be disconnected from the conference call?

b) It cannot be determined from the limitation “disconnecting the first station from the conference call” in lines 12-13 of the claim as with which parties/stations the first station is in the conference call. The structure/connections of the conference to which the first station is connected prior to disconnecting is not described. See *In re Hammack* 166 USPQ 204.

Therefore, the claim is vague and indefinite.

- Claim 54 is vague and indefinite due to the following:

a) the limitation “the conference call” in line 10 of the claim lacks antecedent basis, and  
b) it cannot be determined from the limitation “disconnecting the first station

from the conference call” in lines 8-10 of the claim as with which parties/stations the first station is in the conference call since the structure/connections of the conference to which the first station is connected prior to disconnecting is not described.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. **Claims 13-14 and 21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”).

Per **claim 13**, Schoof teaches receiving *a first conference request signal* (request in step 210 of Fig. 2) at *a first station* (conference controller 130 in Fig. 1A) from *a second station* (one of the participants, e.g. terminal 115 in Fig. 1A, col. 5, ll 56-64) (col. 10, ll 3-6), determining whether the second station is authorized to establish a communication channel with the first station based on *an identification code* (a combination of a password and a participant’s actual name which uniquely identifies the participant) received by the first station (step 420 in Fig. 4, col. 7, ll 46-58, col. 10, ll 7-20, and col. 11, ll 31-34), establishing *a communication channel* (a conference communication connection) between the first station and the second station, if the second station is authorized to establish the communication channel with the first station (step 220 in Fig. 4 and col. 10, ll 7-20).

Per **claim 14**, Schoof teaches that the first station (conference controller 130 in Fig. 1A) is in conference mode (accessing rule base and getting ready to receive conference requests) such that the first station can support a conference call (step 200 in Fig. 2, col. 7, ll 17-25).

Per **claims 21-23**, Schoof, teaches pre-designating *an identification code* (a combination of password and a participant's actual name) of *each authorized station* (authorized participants) in *a memory unit* (memory 500 in Fig. 1B which stores a selected rule base) of *the first station* (conference controller 130 in Fig. 1A) (col. 7, ll 21-29, 53-58, and col. 11, ll 29-34), determining whether the first station receives an authorized identification code from the second station (step 420 in Fig. 4 and col. 10, ll 7-17), signaling the first station from the second station (the participant must provide the password and participant's actual name to controller 130 in Fig. 1A for authorization in step 420 of Fig. 4, col. 7, ll 53-58 and col. 11, ll 31-34), determining whether the first station receives appropriate response signals from the second station (controller determines whether the participant is authorized based on the received password and participant's actual names, col. 10, ll 7-10, col. 7, ll 53-58 and col. 11, ll 31-34), and denying the second station access (a connection between the controller and the requesting participant is not established, step 420 in Fig. 4).

Per **claim 24**, Schoof teaches that the first station is a telephonic device (a conference controller, e.g. 130 in Fig. 1A, having voice capabilities, col. 5, ll 62-col. 6, ll 1-4, 20-32).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-2, 10, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tai et al. (USPN 5,841,976) in view of Schuster (USPN 6,577,622 B1).

Per claim 1, as shown in Fig. 2, Tai et al teach **a first station** (a first computer system 205, col. 11, lines 10-15), **a conference call** (a multipoint conference, col. 11, lines 10-15), **a plurality of other stations** (other computer systems 255, col. 11, lines 10-15), **a packet-switched network** (a communications network 245, i.e. a LAN or Internet, col. 11, lines 53-58), **a storage medium** (a memory 210, col. 11, lines 25-28), a plurality of programming modules (computer instructions, col. 11, lines 25-28), **a means for conferencing** (computer instructions to create a multipoint conferencing node 220, col. 11, lines 16-20 and 25-28), **a means for establishing a communication channel** (since connections between the first computer system 205 and computer systems 255 are established in order to create a multipoint conference, col. 11, lines 58-62, see also col. 4, lines 17-35, and instructions for execution on the processor are stored in a memory 210, col. 11, lines 25-32, therefore, it is inherent that a means for establishing a communication channel must be included in the memory 210 of the first computer system 205), **a conference request signal** (a connect signal to join a conference, col. 5, lines 30-34, 36-40, see also col. 4, lines 17-35, col. 11, lines 18-20 and Fig. 1), **a communication channel between the first station and a second station** (a communication channel 240 connecting the first computer system 204 and other computer system 255 on the left hand side through the network 245 is inherently established by an inherent means for establishing a communication channel in response to a multipoint instructions as shown in Fig. 1, col. 11, lines 53-55 and 58-62), **the**

***communication channel supporting voice communication over the packet-switched network***

(voice communication must be supported during distance learning, col. 4, lines 36-50, and a communication channel 240 is established for a multipoint conference over a LAN or an Internet, col. 11, lines 53-62, therefore, the communication channel must support voice communication over the packet-switched network).

However, Tai et al. fail to teach means for mixing input signals and means for transferring.

Schuster et al. teach ***means for mixing input signals*** which mixes the signals received at a station 208 from a user at station 218 and a user at station 228 to produce a combined signal output which must be played at station 208 to enable user at station 208 to hear what the other users say during a conference (Fig. 8A, col. 19, lines 3-17, see also col. 6, lines 26-28 and Fig. 1, and col. 10, lines 32-35).

Given the teaching of Schuster et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a means for mixing input signals into the first station of Tai et al. to provide the conference participants with each other's communications as taught by Schuster et al. (col. 19, lines 10-17).

Regarding means for transferring, it would have been obvious for one previously connected to a conference call at a first terminal located at a first location to disconnect the first terminal from the call for security purposes and to re-connect to the call at a second terminal located at a second location different from the first location in a case where the second location has specific information which the location does not have and to informing other party(ies) of the disconnection and reconnection prior to disconnecting and reconnecting so that others know

Art Unit: 2663

what is going on. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include into the claim means for transferring (disconnecting and reconnecting) which transfers a communication between the first and second stations to a third station by disconnecting the second station from the conference call and establishing a communication channel between the first station and the third station based upon a transfer signal (informing other parties) transmitted by the second station. The suggestion to do so would have been to utilize the terminals 255 located at different location and the terminal 205 which is a control root node of the conference, i.e. configured to listen for connection signals 260 (Tai et al., col. 11, ll 53-66) to enable a user at the second terminal to re-login and reconnect to the conference call at another one of terminals 255 in Fig. 2 of Tai et al. in a case when the second terminal does not have a specific information.

Per claims 2, and 12, see previous office action.

Per claim 10, the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster since Fig. 2 of Tai et al. shows that the network which computer systems 205 and 255 are connected to is LAN (col. 11, ll 53-58), therefore, any communication communicated on the network must be using an Ethernet packet format which includes the source address of the terminal transmitting the packet. It would have been obvious to include a call-reference (a source address) identifying the second station into the transfer signal (informing other parties of the disconnection and reconnection) of the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to successfully communicate the transfer signal to over the LAN of Tai et al. (Fig. 2, col. 11, ll 53-58).

14. **Claims 3 and 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tai et al. (USPN 5,841,976) in view of Schuster (USPN 6,577,622 B1), and further in view of Zwick (USPN 5,701,340).

Per **claims 3 and 29**, see previous office action.

15. **Claims 4-5, and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tai et al. (USPN 5,841,976) in view of Schuster (USPN 6,577,622 B1), and further in view of Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”).

Per **claims 4-5, and 7**, the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster fail to teach means for authorizing that is configured to prevent the establishing of a communication channel between the first and second stations if the second station is not authorized to obtain access to the conference call, an identification code having a pre-designated association to the conference call, wherein the identification code uniquely identifies the second station and includes a valid call reference having a header as recited in the claims.

However, Schoof, teaches means for authorizing (a selected rule base) that authorizes the second station (a participant) to establish a communication channel (a point to point session connection) upon receiving *an identification code* (a combination of password and participant’s actual name which has a pre-designated association to the conference and uniquely defines the authorized participant, col. 7, ll 21-29, 53-58, col. 11, ll 31-34) and prevents the establishing of a communication channel if the second station is not authorized to access the conference call (step 220 is not performed if the authorization in step 420 fails, Fig. 4), wherein the identification code includes *a valid call reference* (a password, col. 7, ll 53-58)

Given the teaching of Schoof, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster such that means for authorizing, an identification code, and a valid call reference as recited in the claim would be included. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the first station to allow only authorized participant with correct password and actual name to join a conference call as taught by Schoof (col. 7, lines 53-58 and col. 11, ll 31-34).

16. **Claim 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”) view of Zwick (USPN 5,701,340).

Per **claim 15**, Schoof does not teach indicating to the first and second stations the establishment of the communication channel.

However, Zwick teaches indicating the establishing of the communication channel (col. 2, lines 46-48 and col. 3, lines 1-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Schoof to include indicating to the first and second stations the establishment of the communication channel. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to notify the conferees, i.e. the first and second stations, of a new conferee, i.e. the second, entering the conference call for security purposes as taught by Zwick (col. 3, lines 1-2 and 9-13).

17. **Claims 28, 30-34, 37, 39, 40-41, 43, and 57-59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tai et al. (USPN 5,841,976) in view of Schuster (USPN 6,577,622 B1), and further in view of Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”).

**Claim 28** contains the limitations similar to claim 1 (i.e the channel establishment module, a mixed module, and a transfer controller of claim 28 are equivalent to means for

conferencing, means for establishing, means for mixing input signals, and means for transferring in claim 1, respectively) with an addition that the conferencing module is operable to determine whether to establish a communication channel between the first and second stations. Schoof teaches determining whether to establish a communication channel between the first (controller) and second (a participant) stations (step 420 in Fig. 4, col. 10, ll 6-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include determining whether to establish a communication channel between the first (controller) and second (a participant) stations into the teaching of Tai et al. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to allow only authorized station to join the conference call as taught by Schoof (col. 10, ll 7-20).

Per claims 30-34, the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster fail to teach an authorizing module that is configured to prevent the establishing of a communication channel between the first and second stations if the second station is not authorized to obtain access to the conference call, an identification code having a pre-designated association to the conference call, wherein the identification code uniquely identifies the second station and includes a valid call reference having a header as recited in the claims.

However, Schoof, teaches an authorizing module (a selected rule base) that authorizes the second station (a participant) to establish a communication channel (a point to point session connection) upon receiving *an identification code* (a combination of password and participant's actual name) which has a pre-designated association to the conference and uniquely defines the second station (authorized participant) (col. 7, ll 21-29, 53-58, col. 11, ll 31-34) and prevents the establishing of a communication channel if the second station is not authorized to access the

conference call (step 220 is not performed if the authorization in step 420 fails, Fig. 4), wherein the identification code includes *a valid call reference* (a password, col. 7, ll 53-58)

Given the teaching of Schoof, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster such that an authorizing module, an identification code, and a valid call reference as recited in the claim would be included. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the first station to allow only authorized participant with correct password and actual name to join a conference call as taught by Schoof (col. 7, lines 53-58 and col. 11, ll 31-34).

Per **claim 37**, the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster since Fig. 2 of Tai et al. shows that the network which computer systems 205 and 255 are connected to is LAN (col. 11, ll 53-58), therefore, any communication communicated on the network must be using an Ethernet packet format which includes the source address of the terminal transmitting the packet. It would have been obvious to include a call-reference (a source address) identifying the second station into the transfer signal (informing other parties of the disconnection and reconnection) of the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to successfully communicate the transfer signal to over the LAN of Tai et al. (Fig. 2, col. 11, ll 53-58).

**Claims 39 and 57** contain similar limitations as recited in claims 1 and 28, respectively, with an exception of means for transferring/a trasfer controller and an addition of an authorization module/means for authorizing a station to establish a communication channel based upon receiving an identification code, wherein the identification code uniquely identifies the second station. Schoof teaches an authorization module/means for authorizing (a selected

Art Unit: 2663

rule base) that authorizes the second station (a participant) to establish a communication channel (a point to point session connection) based upon receiving *an identification code* (a combination of password and participant's actual name) which uniquely defines the second station (authorized participant) (col. 7, ll 21-29, 53-58, col. 11, ll 31-34).

Given the teaching of Schoof, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Tai et al. and Schuster such that an authorization module/means for authorizing, an identification code, would be included as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the first station to allow only authorized participant with correct password and actual name to join a conference call as taught by Schoof (col. 7, lines 53-58 and col. 11, ll 31-34).

Per claim 40, the combined teaching of Tai et al., Schuster, and Schoof does not teach that the identification code includes a call reference which comprises the header of a data packet indicating a station from which the data packet was received. However, in Fig. 2, Tai et al. teach conducting a conference call over a LAN (col. 11, ll 53-58), and it is well known in the art that an Ethernet packet having a header with a source address is used in the LAN. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the identification code of the combined teaching of Tai et al., Schuster, and Schoof to include a call reference which comprises the header of a data packet indicating a station from which the data packet was received. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the identification code to be communicated over the LAN of Tai et al.

Per claims 41 and 43 contain similar limitation as recited in claims 7 and 10, respectively, and are rejected with the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 7 and 10, respectively.

Per claims 58 and 59 contain similar limitation as recited in claims 6 and 7, respectively, and are rejected with the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 6 and 7, respectively.

18. **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tai et al. (USPN 5,841,976) in view of Schuster (USPN 6,577,622 B1), and further in view of Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”) and Zwick (USPN 5,701,340).

Per claim 29, the combined teaching of Tai et al., Schuster, and Schoof fails to teach sending a signal to indicate the establishing of the communication channel(s).

However, Zwick teaches transmitting a signal and causes the plurality of stations (connected conferees) to indicate the establishing of the communication channel (col. 2, lines 46-48 and col. 3, lines 1-13).

Given the teaching of Zwick, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Tai et al., Schuster, and Schoof to include transmitting a signal and causes the plurality of stations to indicate the establishing of the communication channel into the conferencing module of the combined teaching of Tai et al. Schuster, and Schoof. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to notify the connected conferees, including a new conferee, when the new conferee, e.g. the second station, enters the conference call for security purposes as taught by Zwick (col. 3, lines 1-2 and 9-13).

19. **Claim 45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof, II (USPN 5,440,624, hereafter “Schoof”).

**Claim 45** is a corresponding logic embodied in computer-readable media corresponding to claim 13, and is rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 13 with an exception that Schoof does not teach a logic embodied in computer-readable media. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide logic embodied in computer-readable media to execute the steps recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide automatic execution of the claimed steps without human intervention.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

20. Claims 61-64 are allowed. The prior art alone or in combination fail to teach or make obvious on the following when considered in combination with other limitations in the claim: if determining that the first station cannot support a communication channel for voice communication over the packet switched network with a second station, sending a transfer signal which includes a conference request command designating a fourth station.

***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 13, 21, 28, 32, 39, 45, and 57 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

a) In the remarks regarding claims 1 and 28, the applicant argues that Tai and Schuster, both alone and in combination, fail to teach "means for transferring ... by disconnecting the second station from the conference call and establishing a communication channel between the first station and the third station based upon a transfer signal transmitted by said second station."

In response, it would have been obvious for one previously connected to a conference call at a first terminal located at a first location to disconnect the first terminal from the call for security purposes and to re-connect to the call at a second terminal located at a second location different from the first location in a case where the second location has specific information which the location does not have and to informing other party of the disconnection and reconnection prior to disconnecting and reconnecting so that others know what is going on. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include into the claims means for transferring/a transfer controller (disconnecting and reconnecting) that transfers a communication between the first and second stations to a third station by disconnecting the second station from the conference call and establishing a communication channel between the first station and the third station based upon a transfer signal (informing other parties) transmitted by the second station. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to *utilize the terminals 255 located at different location and the terminal 205 which is a control root node of the conference, i.e. configured to listen for connection signals 260* (Tai et al., col. 11, ll 53-66) to enable a user at the second terminal to re-login and reconnect to the conference call at another one of terminals 255 in Fig. 2 of Tai et al. in a case when the second terminal does not have a specific information. It would have been easier for the user to move than to relocate the computer terminal in Fig. 2. Moreover, since the terminal 205 is operating as a control rood node, it would have been obvious for the user to disconnect the second terminal from the control node for security purposes and reconnect to the control node via another terminal by sending in a request to join the conference. Therefore, the rejections to claims 1 and 28 and their respective dependents are maintained.

b) In the remarks regarding claims 5, 13, 21, 32, 39, 45, and 57, the applicant argues that Schoof does not teach “the identification code uniquely identifies the second station.”

In response, Schoof, when taken as a whole, teaches *an identification code* (a combination of a password and *a participant's actual name*) which uniquely identifies the second station (the participant) (step 420 in Fig. 4, col. 7, ll 46-58, col. 10, ll 7-20, and col. 11, ll 31-34). Therefore, the rejections to claims 5, 13, 21, 32, 39, 45, and 57 and their respective dependents are sustained.

### ***Conclusion***

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nittaya Juntima whose telephone number is 703-306-4821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-5340. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nittaya Juntima  
July 21, 2004



CHAU NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600